



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/520,040

12/27/2004

John W. Bogdan

8307

7590  
John W Bogdan  
1210 Major Street  
Ottawa, K2C 2S2  
CANADA

02/09/2009

EXAMINER

JOHNSON, RYAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2817

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/09/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/520,040	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BOGDAN, JOHN W.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Ryan J. Johnson	<b>Art Unit</b> 2817	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ryan J. Johnson. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) John W. Bogdan. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 05 February 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 68,69 and 88-91.

Identification of prior art discussed: Reuveni (Patent No. 6,987,817).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached.    g) ☒ was not reached.    h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Ryan J. Johnson/ Examiner, Art Unit 2817	/R. P./ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2817
--	---

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

#### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

#### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The topic of the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) was first discussed. The Examiner notified Applicant the the proposed IDS would meet U.S. requirements, but advised Applicant not to submit the IDS unless with a subsequent RCE (request for continued examination) due to rule 37 CFR 1.97(d). If a Notice of Allowance is mailed in response to any after-final amendment, the examiner will cite the previously cited references within a form 892.

Discussion of the objection to the specification was discussed. The Examiner recommended Applicant amend the specification to correspond to the original background art section. The Examiner noted the advice of a TQAS, where any amendment that introduces matter not inherent, intrinsic, or implicit in the original specification is objectionable. The Examiner noted that the abstract, drawings, complete specification, and claims are considered parts of the disclosure of the invention. The Examiner also noted that objections are not subject to appeal and are only petitionable, and that should future amendments bring the claims to allowance, prosecution will remain closed, and a Quayle action will be mailed.

The Examiner noted that such arguments and amendments would result in claims 88-91 as allowable, and would result in a withdrawal of the rejection to claim 69 (allowable determination tentative on a search). Claim 68 would remain rejected.

The Examiner discussed the requirements to argue a non-enabling disclosure of a prior art reference, including an affidavit or declaration containing a preponderance of evidence that the prior art is non-enabling as disclosed and claimed within the context of the prior art. The Examiner also explained that claim 68 was broad enough to read on the prior art and would remain rejected under 102(e). The Examiner explained that essential subject matter of the prior art not claimed in the present application is irrelevant while interpreting compliance under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103, and that the compliance of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112 are interpreted independently of one another. The Examiner suggested amending claim 68 to further distinguish the invention from the prior art, whether by explicitly reciting in the claims that the current invention does not contain certain essential matter of the prior art, or by incorporating an aspect of the current invention not taught by the prior art. The Examiner notes that such an amendment would most likely require a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and that another alternative would be canceling claim 68 and further pursuing it in a continuation.